Univ. of Ill. Library
53
1987

INTRODUCTION

The sub-committee requested by the University Committee to study the problems of post-war planning in the University presents the following report on those problems dealing specifically with the library. The discussion of post-war library problems has been based on several assumptions which seem to be clearly justified by action and attitude of the faculty and administrative officers. The first of these is that by making possible the survey which was made of the University of Georgia Library situation by Dr. Wilson, Mr. Branscomb, Mr. Dunbar and Mr. Lyle in 1938, the University was interested in providing more adequate library resources and services. Further, that by virtue of the University's unique position among institutions of higher learning in Georgia, the library is destined for a position of leadership among the libraries in the state. Another assumption has been that by virtue of the invitation extended this sub-committee, the University expects the post-war support of the library to be commensurate with the vital role it is to play in the educational program. Lastly, it has been assumed that the post-war planning committee wanted the recommendations of the faculty as well as the Director of Libraries on matters affecting the University library program.

This report is not an exhaustive one but is confined to some major problems which are closely related to the educational program of the University. These fall into the following five groups:

1. Library Buildings
2. Development of Library Resources
3. Library Support
4. Integration of the Library with the Educational Program
5. State and Regional Library Cooperation

I

LIBRARY BUILDINGS

The University's General Library has known only one home of its own — the gift of George Foster Peabody. This building, completed in 1905, was for many years adequate, but at the present time its limitations represent the greatest single obstacle to effective library service. It is interesting to note that the building was designed to serve a student body of 375 and a faculty of 35. These figures present quite a contrast to the size of our University community at present and serve to emphasize the tremendous need for a new, functional library building. Certainly, more ample stack space for books, reading and study rooms for students and faculty, and work rooms for the staff are immediate problems. Fortunately, this problem is very likely to be solved as soon as critical building materials are available after the war. Mrs. John D. Little bequeathed to the University an estate, estimated now to be approximately $500,000, to be used for the construction of a library building on Franklin campus. The sub-committee recommends that this new building provide a bookstack for a minimum of 500,000 volumes; that it provide study space for 40% of the undergraduate student body, 75% of the graduate students and 50% of the faculty, and that the building be so located and planned as to make any needed additions easy in the future. It is assumed that on Franklin campus there will be between 3,500 and 4,000 students, 250 graduate students and 200 faculty members.

The Library on the Agricultural campus likewise presents an urgent need for another building. The South Campus Branch was located in Conner Hall until the summer of 1941. By this time, the series of connecting rooms used to shelve and service this Branch collection was wholly inadequate and the collection was moved to Lumpkin House. Since 1941, considerable additions have been made to the collection and efforts to stimulate undergraduate use of the library have

LIBRARY BUILDING

The University's General Library has known only two homes in the course of Georgia Senior Academy. The building, completed in 1908, was for many years adequate, but at the present time its limitations represent the greatest single obstacle to effective library service. It is interesting to note that the building was designed to serve a student body of 350 and a faculty of 35. These figures present quite a contrast to the size of our University community at present and serve to emphasize the tremendous need for a new, functional library building. Certainly, more ample study space for books, reading and study rooms for students and faculty, and work rooms for the staff are immediate problems. Fortunately, this problem is very likely to be solved as soon as critical building materials are available after the war. Dr. Little bequeathed to the University an estate, estimated now to be approximately $800,000, to be used for the construction of a library building on Franklin campus. The sub-committee recommends that this new building provide a bookstack for a minimum of 300,000 volumes; that it provide study space for 40% of the undergraduate student body, 75% of the graduate students and 50% of the faculty, and that the building be so located and planned as to make any needed additions easy in the future. It is assumed that on Franklin campus there will be between 3,800 and 4,000 students, 250 graduate students and 300 faculty members.

The library on the Agricultural campus likewise presents an urgent need for another building. The South Campus Branch was located in Conner Hall until the summer of 1941. By this time, the series of accessions records used to stamp and service this Branch collection was wholly inadequate and the collection was moved to Lumpkin House. Since 1941, considerable additions have been made to the collection and efforts to stimulate undergraduate use of the library have

stepped up the use of reading rooms. Therefore, the sub-committee recommends that the library building program include new buildings on Franklin campus and South campus.

The South Branch building should provide a bookstack for at least 75,000 volumes, study space for 30% of the undergraduate student body, 50% of the graduate students and 30% of the faculty. It is assumed that there will be between 1,500 and 2,000 students, 150 graduate students and a faculty of approximately 120.

The sub-committee recommends that special reading and research facilities be provided for related subject groups in the new library buildings. In this way those using the library will have the benefit of greater accessibility of related literatures and specialized reference assistance at less cost in administration and duplication. The sub-committee urges that special attention be given now to the planning of the building so that the University will be prepared when the opportunity to build comes.

The sub-committee did not consider seriously the case of the Coordinate College Branch, since there is reason to believe that this branch will be discontinued as soon as adequate provisions can be made for freshmen and sophomore girls on South campus. It is the recommendation of the sub-committee that this branch with its duplication of book collections and personnel be eliminated as soon as practicable. It is further recommended that the book collection now at the Coordinate College Branch be used to enrich the general collections and that the personnel be used to assist the general library and South Branch in the prosecution of their programs.

The sub-committee further recommends that the building program for the library include the installation of a second bookstack floor in the Law Library. The library bookstack on the second floor of Hirsch Hall was designed for a two-tier, steel bookstack but only the first level was installed when the building

The South Branch building should provide a bookstack for at least 75,000 volumes, study space for 30% of the undergraduate student body, 80% of the graduate students and 80% of the faculty. It is assumed that there will be between 1,800 and 2,000 students, 150 graduate students and a faculty of approximately 120.

The sub-committee recommends that special reading and research facilities be provided for related subjects grouped in the new Library building. In this way those using the Library will have the benefit of greater accessibility of related literatures and specialized reference assistance at fewer posts in duplication and duplication. The sub-committee urges that special attention be given now to the planning of the building so that the University will be prepared when the opportunity to build comes.

The sub-committee did not consider seriously the case of the Secondaire College Branch, since there is reason to believe that this branch will be discontinued as soon as adequate provision can be made for freshmen and sophomore girls on South campus. It is the recommendation of the sub-committee that this branch with the duplication of book collections and personnel be eliminated as soon as practicable. It is further recommended that the book collection now at the Coordinate College Branch be used to enrich the general collections and that the personnel be used to assist the General Library and South Branch in the prosecution of their programs.

The sub-committee further recommends that the building program for the library include the installation of a second bookstack floor in the Law Library. The library bookstack on the second floor of Ethnos Hall was designed for a two-tier, steel bookstack but only the first level was installed when the building

was occupied. The steady acquisition of new material in the Law Library has exhausted the present shelf capacity and the second stack level should be installed as soon as possible.

II

DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARY RESOURCES

There is a definite lag between existing resources and needs of the library judged by criteria such as adequacy of the University Library to support expansion in the curricula, amount of borrowing necessary to support graduate study under direction of members of our faculty, representations of the University Library in such surveys as Downs' Resources of Southern Libraries, Barker's Libraries of the South, and findings of the University of Georgia Library Survey Committee.

During the last eight years, the University of Georgia Library has increased its annual growth from 2,400 volumes to over 10,000 volumes. The enlarged buying program has been made possible by more adequate book appropriations from the University budget and by special grants from the General Education Board for the purchase of materials. It is significant that the University has provided more adequately for library purchasing. The growing emphasis among the faculty upon collateral reading materials and term papers and reports has created a much larger demand for library materials. The increase in our book budget has been used first of all to cover these demands. Then, too, the development of the graduate school between 1937 and 1942 created many new demands for library materials. However, despite the acceleration in the growth of our library collections, the University Library falls far short of being able to support a more intensive use of our undergraduate collections and certainly far short of supporting any expansion in our graduate school program.

In this connection, it is desirable to note the experience of at least one sister institution whose leadership in the library field is unquestioned. Soon after the turn of this century, the University of North Carolina was faced with

II

DEVELOPMENT OF LIBRARY RESOURCES

There is a definite lag between existing resources and needs of the University judged by criteria such as adequacy of the University Library to support expansion in the curricula, amount of borrowing necessary to support graduate study under direction of members of our faculty, representations of the University Library in such surveys as Downs' *Resources of Southern Libraries*, Barton's *Libraries of the South*, and findings of the University of Georgia Library Survey Committee.

During the last eight years, the University of Georgia Library has increased its annual growth from 3,400 volumes to over 10,000 volumes. The enlarged buying program has been made possible by more adequate book appropriations from the University budget and by special grants from the General Education Board for the purchase of materials. It is significant that the University has provided more adequately for library purchasing. The growing emphasis among the faculty upon collateral reading materials and term papers and reports has created a much larger demand for library materials. The increase in our book budget has been used first of all to cover these demands. Then, too, the developers of the graduate school between 1937 and 1942 created many new demands for library materials. However, despite the acceleration in the growth of our library collections, the University Library fails far short of being able to support a more intensive use of our undergraduate collections and certainly far short of supporting any expansion in our graduate school program.

In this connection, it is desirable to note the experience of at least one sister institution whose leadership in the library field is unquestioned. Soon after the turn of this century, the University of North Carolina was faced with

the necessity of materially increasing its library resources in as short a time as possible. With the whole-hearted support of the University faculty, the Director of Libraries developed a buying plan and the University administration appropriated large sums for a number of years in order to execute the plan. There are several factors in this situation which are important. First of all, it took the active cooperation of the faculty to map an adequate buying program. In the second place, it was thoroughly understood that a well-defined plan for acquisition was essential. In the third place, it was conceded by the administration that large, special appropriations were required annually over a period of years. I cite the experience of North Carolina because it seems to be more comparable to our own situation. Precisely the same experience has been true in the cases of Louisiana State University Library, Duke University Library and several other institutions, which, during the last 20 or 30 years, have been faced with the necessity of developing a Liberal Arts Library into a great University Library.

The sub-committee feels very strongly that the most urgent need is for a well-defined buying program. A plan must precede the opportunity to buy if the buying is to be most effective. In line with this recommendation, the sub-committee strongly urges that faculty committees be appointed in the subject fields expecting to offer graduate work after the war and that these committees be charged with the responsibility of evaluating present library resources and with the responsibility for making specific recommendations for the purchase of needed additional material.

III

LIBRARY SUPPORT

Unfortunately, too much weight in discussions regarding development of our University Library is attached to the somewhat erroneous assumption that per capita income in Georgia is a primary limiting factor. It is true that the per capita income is two or three times greater in the far West and Northeast

III

LIBRARY SUPPORT

Unfortunately, too much weight is discounted regarding development of our University Library is attached to the somewhat erroneous assumption that per capita income in Georgia is a primary limiting factor. It is true that the per capita income is two or three times greater in the Far West and Northeast

than in the Southeast. It does not follow, however, that within the Southeastern region the states with the largest per capita incomes appropriate the largest amount in support of their State University Libraries. The following table offers some interesting figures and the figures were chosen for the more or less normal year 1940-41:

RELATION BETWEEN PER CAPITA INCOME AND LIBRARY SUPPORT

State	Per Capita Income	Popul'n 1940	Expended* for Higher Educ'n	Total Univ. Expenditures	Univ. Library Budget	% of Univ. Inc.	No. of vols. in Library
Miss.	$220	2,183,796	$ 7,307,000	$ 809,081	$ 21,115.75	2.6	83,849
Ark.	247	1,949,387	5,228,000	1,013,000	57,014.00	5.6	172,748
Ala.	268	2,832,961	11,116,000	1,763,470	95,866.81	5.4	250,499
S.C.	287	1,899,804	9,434,000	755,102	33,133.07	4.3	156,667
Ga.	313	3,123,723	10,007,000	1,236,500	72,020.00	5.8	154,565
Ky.	316	2,845,627	8,598,000	1,632,417	66,487.58	4.01	302,889
N.C.	318	3,571,623	21,300,000	1,924,752	110,032.00	5.2	403,051
Tenn.	320	2,915,841	12,640,000	1,821,810	72,714.48	3.9	211,287
La.	366	2,363,880	16,965,000	4,416,320	145,486.00	3.2	306,945

*Including current expenditures, capital, outlay and auxiliary activities.

There are four states in the Southeastern region whose per capita incomes are less than Georgia's, of which two have consistently supported more adequately their University Libraries, with the result that they are considerably larger than Georgia's. There is, apparently, more relationship between State recognition of library assets and financial support than between per capita income and library support. It is interesting to note that in a year when the per capita income in Georgia was $313 and the per capita income in North Carolina was $318, the latter supported its library with $110,000 while Georgia provided only $72,000. The difference is even more marked during the period from 1920-1940. The difference in support directly explains the fact that the University of North Carolina now has a library approximately three times larger than the library of the University of Georgia. The sub-committee recommends that greater financial support be given the University Library and that this support be from three sources — the state appropriation, gifts and endowments, and grants-in-aid from foundations.

The sub-committee recommends that in the first five years of the post-

war period, the University of Georgia Library should receive a general book fund of not less than $50,000 annually. During the five-year period following the end of the war, the general book fund should be increased year by year beyond the $50,000 minimum in order to meet the anticipated steady increase in demand for library materials. In addition, the library should receive the sum of $175,000 for research materials. Of this amount, $50,000 should be made available for the purchase of foreign language research materials as soon as the foreign book market is open; the remaining $125,000 should be made available at the rate of $25,000 a year for the purchase of additional research materials. The sub-committee believes that these amounts should be appropriated for the first five years immediately following the war during which the University will be assembling its post-war faculty. The sub-committee likewise believes that still larger amounts will be needed when the fields of specialization of faculty members are crystallized and when the directions of graduate study are firmly established.

It is clearly evident that during the last several years the Board of Regents and President Caldwell have been thoroughly sympathetic with the library program and have considered favorably the budgets recommended by the library. Knowing of the interest of the University administrators in developing the library program, the sub-committee recommends that an increase in the appropriation from the state be used in approaching the General Education Board for additional grants-in-aid. This recommendation is based upon the assumption that the General Education Board will not be interested in making a grant for the purchase of library materials until it is clearly shown that there is more generous internal support.

It is further recommended by the sub-committee that the Alumni Society, the Director of Libraries, and representatives from the faculty explore the possibilities of gifts and endowments from Alumni and friends.

IV

INTEGRATION OF THE LIBRARY WITH THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

No one problem of the library can be singled out as being more important than all the others. Yet, the very foundation of the library rests upon the educational program of the University. The complete integration of the library with the educational program is vital and success depends largely upon clearly defined objectives for the University as a whole and the enunciation of objectives for our special curricula and the Graduate School. Further, success depends upon the mutual responsiveness and teamwork of the faculty and the library staff.

In no course should the library represent just a method of handling class preparation. The library — meaning its resources and services — must become the fulfillment of certain phases of teaching. For many courses the classroom should be the clearing house for ideas and information absorbed by the student after the prolonged investigation of library resources. This concept is well recognized among educators and is urged as an alternative for the overworked textbook-lecture method of teaching. It has been demonstrated that the student retains a high percentage of information he discovers through his own efforts. Therefore, one of the primary functions of the professor is to stimulate the student's curiosity, encourage his investigation of source materials, and facilitate his access to those materials.

The sub-committee recommends that the faculty reemphasize the values of investigation and use of library collections through such means as (1) assignments of term papers, term problems, senior "theses," and assignments requiring abstracting of library materials and making of bibliographies; (2) class meetings in the library, spotlighting required and collateral reading, collections for classroom use; (3) the introduction of Honors courses which require wide use of books and depend heavily upon use of library collections; (4) use of independent reading courses for the superior student who has demonstrated his ability to use the library effectively.

It is evident from the quality of work submitted by students, based on use of library materials, and on observation of students using the library, that few students are prepared to use library materials effectively. For instance, an analysis of services rendered at the Reference Desk in the General Library reveals that 70% of the librarian's time is spent in individual instruction in use of the public card catalog, periodical indexes, in the function of bibliographies, and in the interpretation of library resources. The sub-committee, therefore, recommends that, at the earliest possible date, a program of student orientation to the Library be inaugurated. New students in the freshman and sophomore classes should be required to take a standard test of ability to use libraries and all students who show insufficient library background should be subject to special attention in the orientation program.

It should be noted here that some members of the sub-committee wondered if such an orientation program would not be more effective if offered to students beginning senior college work. Obviously, this will depend upon the methods of instruction used in the junior college courses and details of the above recommendation can be worked out in accordance with the action of the faculty on the recommendations of the Post-War Planning Committee.

Integration of the library with the program for graduate study requires an extension of the same mutual responsiveness and teamwork of the faculty and library staff. The sub-committee recommends that adequate study facilities be provided in the library building for both graduate students and faculty members engaged in research. The close proximity of the user to research materials is vitally important.

The sub-committee further recommends that all faculty members responsible for the supervision of graduate study maintain a close working relationship between themselves and the library in order to insure the wise use of existing materials and the systematic selection of additional resources. Book selection in highly specialized fields is primarily the responsibility of the faculty and

facilitating the addition of these recommended research materials is the responsibility of the library staff. This division of labor, however, does not discharge the library staff from the duty of assisting the faculty members in their search for new materials and it is recommended that individual faculty members work out with the Director of Libraries services which will activate this program.

In order that the Director of Libraries shall be in a position to follow closely the plans and progress of the educational program of the whole University, the sub-committee recommends that the Director be a member of those committees and groups of the faculty which determine educational policy and curriculum changes. The recent invitation to the Director to meet with the Executive Committee of the Graduate Faculty is in line with this recommendation.

The sub-committee further recommends that the fields of specialization in research be determined for the University in general as a prerequisite to an effective and well adapted library.

The University Faculty has expressed repeatedly its approval of the use of audio-visual aids in teaching and has noted with interest the significant use of these aids by the Army and Navy in their teaching programs. Every subject taught on the campus represents a potential need for recordings, films, filmstrips, slides, etc. Thus far, relatively few members of the Faculty use these aids because they are not always accessible from distributing agencies when needed, because expense is a deterrent, and because there has been little or no opportunity to know what is available. The members of the sub-committee believe that after the war there will be a heavy demand on the campus for audio-visual aids and recommend that the Director of Libraries expand the resources in this type of material, develop a service in audio-visual aids and provide suitable facilities for the storage and use of these materials in the new library buildings. Further, the sub-committee recommends that the transfer of the Audio-Visual Extension Service from the Division of General Extension to the University of Georgia Library be explored.

V

STATE AND REGIONAL LIBRARY COOPERATION

The University of Georgia Library is destined to become a leader in college and university library activity in the state. This position will involve among its responsibilities the matter of cooperation with other libraries. Some suggestion of this responsibility has already been made by a sub-committee of the Advisory Faculty Council for the University Center. Its report submitted to the council last November states that "(the sub-committee) is convinced of the importance of developing very much stronger library resources in this central region not only for purposes of research but also for the social and cultural enrichment of the state in general, and recognizes that we can compete with other regions in acquiring such resources only by careful cooperative planning by the libraries concerned." Specifically, that sub-committee recommended:

1. The Council of Presidents be asked to exert its influence in bringing the faculties of their institutions to plan their graduate work more specifically, and on the basis of this planning to direct the selection of new faculty personnel toward a clearer pattern of co-operation.

2. That every agency possible should be utilized to eliminate what distrust and insularity still exist among the faculties of the participating institutions, and to develop that spirit of friendly understanding and co-operation upon which the success of the entire project, not merely the library project, depends.

3. That the Council of Presidents be asked to appoint a standing committee on library co-operation consisting of the librarians of the three central libraries involved in research, and one representative of the faculty of each of these institutions.

That it be the duty of this committee to explore further the gaps in basic collections; to assist in the elimination of further duplication of materials, at present of secondary importance; and to supervise the pattern which growing co-operation in library work is to assume.

That present regulations for the exchange of materials and the use of libraries within the Center be retained, but that they be liberalized further whenever the needs justify and the above committee approves.

That the Union Catalog be completed as quickly as possible, and that the above committee be given the responsibility of publicizing the catalog and instructing the faculties in its values and use.

4. That, aside from those patterns of specialized growth which are already visible, co-operation in the acquisition of materials be based, for the present, upon conferences between the library consultants of related

U. OF ILL. LIB.
LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Duties of Union List Committee

The Administrator of Georgia Library is directed to appoint a Union List Committee consisting of ten members, five of whom shall be librarians and five of whom shall be laymen, one of the latter to be the State Librarian, who shall be the chairman of the Committee. The duties of the Committee shall be to prepare a Union List of Periodicals in the libraries of Georgia, and to keep the list up to date. The Committee shall have the power to employ such assistants as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and to fix their salaries, subject to the approval of the Governor and Council. The Committee shall have the power to call upon any library in the State for such information as may be necessary to the preparation of the Union List, and it shall be the duty of each library to furnish such information promptly and accurately.

Section 3. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to make such rules and regulations governing the use of the Union List of Periodicals by libraries and individuals as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and to prescribe penalties for violations of such rules and regulations, not to exceed the sum of $100.00 for each violation.

Section 4. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to employ a Secretary, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $2,500.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 5. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Treasurer, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 6. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Clerk, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 7. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Librarian, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 8. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Secretary, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 9. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Treasurer, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 10. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Clerk, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 11. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Librarian, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 12. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Secretary, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 13. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Treasurer, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 14. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Clerk, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 15. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Librarian, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 16. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Secretary, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 17. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Treasurer, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 18. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Clerk, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 19. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Librarian, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Section 20. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the Union List Committee shall have the power to appoint a Secretary, who shall be a librarian, and who shall receive a salary of $1,000.00 per year, payable monthly from funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

departments in the Center.

That each department be asked to consult both the Union Catalog and their colleagues in other institutions before ordering expensive rarely used, or other unusual materials.

That related departments be asked to consult as early as expedient concerning the possibility of a division of labor in the acquisition of special collections.

That methods of facilitating the physical exchange of material and other co-operative use of the libraries be developed and publicized as soon as possible.

That visual aids to research, in the form of reading projectors be added to each of the three libraries, and portable cameras be acquired by the Center as a whole.

That the committee prepare a unified report of the estimated plans and needs of the libraries to be submitted to the joint Advisory Faculty Council as soon as possible, and forwarded by them to the Council of Presidents for further use.

The sub-committee on post-war planning for the library approved in principle the above recommendations and further recommends that a Micro-Photographic laboratory be established at the University of Georgia to extend the usefulness of research materials by photostating or filming rather than by duplicate purchasing. A Micro-Photographic laboratory would also enable the University of Georgia Library to increase its resources of research material not available for purchase.

Members of the sub-committee felt that library cooperation could be furthered by a wider publicity of outstanding research collections. The union catalog of collections in fourteen Atlanta and Athens libraries has done much in this direction. However, it is impossible at the present time to maintain more than two copies of this union catalog, one here and one at Emory University Library. Although a copy of the catalog is accessible to researchers in Atlanta, there are scholars located elsewhere in the state and in the Southeastern region who should know more about the contents of our library. The sub-committee recommends that information about our collections be disseminated through an existing medium if appropriate, or through a new medium if necessary.

There is a tremendous need for greater library cooperation in the collection of (1) historical source material related to the South; (2) newspapers; (3) public documents. There has been little or no specialization among Georgia libraries or libraries in the Southeastern region in the collection and preservation of historical source materials. Manuscripts and personal family papers have been collected indiscriminately and without regard for their ultimate usefulness. Much material has been collected by libraries which have not, thus far, been able to make it accessible to scholars, nor is there much likelihood that these libraries will have sufficient staffs to make the material accessible very soon. In many cases, private papers have by acquisition or accident become located far from the section of the country most vitally interested in them. The sub-committee recommends that cooperating libraries establish a fixed responsibility regarding the collection of this type of material. Apropos of this problem, the sub-committee recommends that the possibility of housing the State Department of Archives on the University campus be explored.

No adequate plan is in operation for the preservation of Georgia newspapers; many files have not been preserved except in the editor's office. Those files which are located outside of fire-proof library buildings are ever subject to destruction. It is essential that a plan of cooperation be worked out among the college and university libraries of Georgia to provide for the preservation of comprehensive files of our state's papers. On the other hand, in Georgia, there are few files of outstanding American newspapers which are representative of other sections of our country. Some library, or better still cooperating libraries, should provide for the preservation of files representative of sectional attitudes, such as papers from Charleston, Detroit, St. Louis, Denver, San Antonio, Los Angeles, and Seattle.

There is also great need for cooperation among Georgia libraries for the collection and preservation of Federal and State documents. There is no library in Georgia which is a complete depository of U. S. Government documents.

Possibly, no one library should assume the responsibility for collecting all of them. The regrettable fact, however, is that there is great duplication among these collections. The sub-committee recommends that a plan for the systematic future collection in Georgia of public documents be formulated. There are few files of the documents from other states located in Georgia, and the responsibility for collection in this field should be well fixed.

There are four cooperative university centers in the South, located at Nashville, Durham-Chapel Hill, Atlanta-Athens, and New Orleans-Baton Rouge. The sub-committee recommends that the University Library, as a member of the Atlanta-Athens University Center, plan cooperatively with the other university centers. An objective of such planning would be to concentrate in the Southeastern region those research materials most likely to be needed by the graduate students and faculty on this campus, eliminating the necessity of traveling thousands of miles to libraries in other parts of the country. A further objective would be the wider knowledge of resources relatively close at hand and the establishment of more liberal inter-library loan privileges. Obviously with a cooperative plan, some needless duplication of expensive research materials could be avoided. In this respect, the sub-committee recommends that after the war representative committees of the Southern university centers meet to formulate a buying program for cooperating institutions.

Respectfully submitted,

SUB-COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY

John E. Drewry
R. P. Stephens
Louise Fant
Austin S. Edwards
Duncan Burnet
Eugene P. Odum
Matilda Callaway
Archie E. Patterson
Edwin M. Everett
E. Claybrook Griffith
K. M. Autrey
Albert B. Saye
Wayne S. Yenawine, Chairman

possibly, no one library should assume the responsibility for collecting all of them. The regrettable fact, however, is that there is great duplication among these collections. The sub-committee recommends that a plan for the systematic future collection in Georgia of public documents be formulated. There are few files of the documents from other states located in Georgia, and the responsibility for collection in this field should be well fixed.

There are four cooperative university centers in the South, located at Nashville, Durham-Chapel Hill, Atlanta-Athens, and New Orleans-Baton Rouge. The sub-committee recommends that the University Library, as a member of the Atlanta-Athens University Center, plan cooperatively with the other university centers. An objective of such planning would be to concentrate in the Southeastern region those research materials most likely to be needed by the graduate students and faculty on this campus, eliminating the necessity of traveling thousands of miles to libraries in other parts of the country. A further objective would be the wider knowledge of resources relatively close at hand and the establishment of more liberal inter-library loan privileges. Obviously with a cooperative plan, some needless duplication of expensive research materials could be avoided. In this respect, the sub-committee recommends that after the war representative committees of the Southern university centers meet to formulate a buying program for cooperating institutions.

Respectfully submitted,

SUB-COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY

John E. Drewry
R. P. Stephens
Louise Pratt
Austin S. Edwards
Duncan Burnet
Eugene P. Odum
Matilda Dallaway
Archie K. Patterson
Edwin H. Everett
H. Glaybrook Griffith
F. P. Autrey
Albert H. Sapp
Wayne S. Yenawine, Chairman